



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,302	06/06/2003	Brian J. Schimmoller	P-122152.01 (UTI)	5876

7590 04/28/2005

JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.  
Suite 2100  
112 E. Pecan Street  
San Antonio, TX 78205

EXAMINER

RAEVIS, ROBERT R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2856

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/601,302

Applicant(s)

SCHIMMOLLER ET AL.

Examiner

Robert R. Raevis

Art Unit

2856

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-13 and 15-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2856

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 8, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 8, "leading edge" and "trailing edge" both lack antecedent basis. (Compare with claim 2 which recites those same limitations in a positive manner by stating that "each of the surfaces *defining* a leading edge and a trailing edge" (italics added, claim 2.) Also, "its" (last line) is misplaced. (Either delete the "its" (last line), or place that word before "adjacent" (last line).)

As to claim 15, does line 1 mean that the "vehicle" engages "the frame of the vehicle"? In effect, does the vehicle engage itself? (Should "of" (line 1) read -- , --? Also, is the device really being used ("use" on line 3) while "within" (line 3) the vehicle? Isn't it being used while "exposed" (line 4)? Finally, "the airframe" (last line) lacks antecedent basis.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Turman.

Art Unit: 2856

Turman teaches a method to sample air, including: providing an "aerodynamic" (col. 2, line 40) housing 11; providing an "aircraft" (col. 2, line 37); attaching the housing to the aircraft; and moving the aircraft through the air. The "aerodynamic" configuration allows for permitting a level of control of aircraft direction.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,5,13,3,4,7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sainsbury in view of Kataoka.

Sainsbury teaches (Figure 6) a device, including: a "aerodynamic" (col. 3, line 11) shaped device 22 that includes a mesh bag 67.

Sainsbury does not state what the bag is constructed of.

As to claims 1,2,5,3,7,8,9,11, it would have been obvious to utilize Kataoka's bag (col. 3, lines 25-30) for Sainsbury's bag because Kataoka teaches that a mesh bag may be constructed of absorbant material when "strength" (col. 3, line 20) is required, as is required in Sainsbury's ("strong" on col. 6, line 30) bag. No weight was given to intended usage in this apparatus claim.

As to claims 13,4,12, it would have been obvious to employ any strong material for Sainsbury housing, as the reference is silent as to any particular material.

As to claim 10, frame 60 diameter and/or length is from 1 to 12 inches.

Art Unit: 2856

Claims 1,2,5,13,3,4,7,8,9,10,11,12,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turman in view of Kataoka, and further in view of Sainsbury.

Turman teaches every limitation of claim 1, but does not state what the material of construction of filter 80 is.

As to claims 1,2,5,3,7,8,9, it would have been obvious to employ Kataoka's material (col. 3, lines 20-35) as a filter because Sainsbury teaches that a bag material may be employed to collect samples via aircraft usage.

As to claims 13,4,12, it would have been obvious to employ any strong material for Turman's housing as the reference is silent as to any particular material.

As to claims 10,11, compare the scale of Sainsbury's sampler with Turman, suggestive of the same relative sizes.

As to claim 16, note Turman's bracket 100.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Saaski et al teach a method for sampling air, including: providing a sample collection device 32, providing an "airplane" (col. 7, line 17); attaching the device 32 to the airplane (col. 7, lines 14-28); and moving the vehicle through the air. However, the pipe 32 is not an airfoil.

Barringer removes tape 32 for analysis after collection.

Couchman et al use a filter 20 for sampling air from an aircraft.

Art Unit: 2856

Claims 6 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert R. Raevis whose telephone number is 571-272-2204. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:30am to 4:00pm. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raevis

RAEVIS